THEMES OF CONTEMPORARY PUBLIC MANAGEMENT

E.SAM OVERMAN
G.DAVID GARSON
North Carolina State University

Public management is ensconced in the intellectual tradition of public administration. [1] The brief century-long history of American public adminstration [2] has produced relatively few fundamental changes in its intellectual and paradigmatic structures, but is replete with numerous conceptualizations and competing orientations. [3] The earliest formulation of American public administration is most often characterized as "scientific management" with POSDCORB providing the principal and most successful organizing framework. (Gulick, 1937) Dwight Waldo (1955:55) has outlined a philosophy of early public administration in which "proper analysis of governmental functions divides administration off from politics; the sphere of administration is one to which science can and should be applied; and application of scientific methods of inquiry leads to discovery of principles of organization and management; and these pinciples determine the way in which governmental functions can be administered most economically and efficiiently." The central doctrines of early public administration as reflected in POSDCORB were: 1) a politics-administration dichotomy; 2) a scientific status for public administration; 3) the existence of universal administrative principles; and 4) the application of objective administrative criteria of economy and efficiency.

Even at their pre-World War II preeminent position, the

central doctrines of scientific administration were already being criticized and broadened to include more political and inter-disciplinary concerns. (e.g., see Follett, 1926; Dimock, 1936) In the post-World War II period, the critiques of the central doctrines of scientific administration became even more acute and produced a reformulation of public administration not exactly antithetical to scientific management but selectively broadening its scope and content. Among the early critics was Herbert Simon (1946) who depicted the "principles" of administration as mere proverbs by demonstrating how each principle (e.g., unity of command) held internal contradictions yielding opposite but equally valid organizational prescriptions. Simon revealed a more comprehensive set of meta-criteria in the administrative norms of efficiency and effectiveness. Simon did not debate the scientific approach to public administration; instead, he broadened its methodological scope to include a logical-positivist and behavioralist orientation while under-scoring the rational process of administration.

Robert Dahl (1947), writing at the same time as Simon but from the perspective of a political scientist, delineated what he considered to be three severe problems with the science of administration. Scientific management, Dahl argued, excluded normative considerations, excluded factors of human behavior, and ignored the social setting of administration. The consequences were that scientific management falsely claimed to be value-neutral, unaffected by the influences of human behavior, and universal in application. Long (1949) only added to the critiques of Simon, Dahl, and others by arguing that administration was inherently a question of power and that scientific administrative reforms centralizing power under chief executives would fail to solve the problems they sought to address.

These and other critiques of scientific administration resulted in a second basic formulation of the doctrines of public administration---one which fundamentally questioned the politics-administrative dichotomy. Again, Dwight Waldo (1955) joined by Wallace Sayre (1958) summarized the new doctrines of public administration as: 1) inescapably culture-bound; 2) one of the major political processes; 3) ultimately a question of

political theory; and 4) under the impact of logical-positivism, separating fact from value.

With this new look, the field of public administration became open to a number of contributions from the traditional disciplines such as psychology, political science, economics, and other sectors of academia. However, the search for an organizing framework to replace POSDCORB continued into the 1970s. Among these competing orientations, the major contenders were human relations and organization development, operations research and management science, public choice theory, systems theory, and others. But none has been more successful than policy analysis. Policy analysis was explicitly associated with governmental applications and shared a concern for social and administrative change. It represented a cogent set of methodologies and techniques with broad applications with which to ally the management concerns of public administration. Policy analysis has become the captivating framework for many public administrationists.

In a prophetic study done as a doctoral dissertation at Syracuse University, Eamanuel Wald (1973) outlined the characteristics of two dimensions of public administration by surveying public administration scholars throughout the United States. The patterns of opinion on the future of public administration outlined by Wald indicated a split between conventional public administration on the one side, and the management and policy sciences on the other, reflecting, as he suggests, the ''traditional confrontation between behavioralism and non-behavioralism in the field of public administration.'' (Wald, 1973:371) Wald was really outlining a schism that began with the post-World War II reformulation and continuing to the contemporary conceptualization of public management. Wald's conclusions reflect a debate between public administrationists with a ''crisis perspective'' who view the field of public administration to be in the throes of conflict with no convincing organizing framework and those with a ''coming of age'' perspective who tend to accept the policy analysis conceptualization as a new organizing framework for public management.

It is with this split between the two traditions of public administration that public management began to come into its

own, piggy-backed with the policy sciences. Where policy analysis took as its unit of analysis the policies and programs of government, public management focused on the administrative functions and processes of government which cut across policy and program areas. Scholars managing the field of policy analysis have continually broadened its scope to include administrative and management concerns (Fry and Tompkins, 1978) and such topics as policy implementation and impact are now strongly associated with public management and increasingly included within the same purview. (Salamon, 1980)

Institutional arrangements have developed to cement the relationship of public management and policy analysis. The Association of Public Policy Analysis and Management and the journal of the same name were created in 1979 to encourage excellence in teaching, research, and practice of policy analysis and management. Several of the major policy schools have initiated programs in public management and others now offer professional degrees in the field. Many schools, most often the business schools, have opened up generic management programs for both public and private sectors. [4]

Contemporary Public Management

Historically the primary focus of public management has been on the level of urban and local government. There has been a need at this level for a comprehensive approach to common practical problems of public administration. For over sixty years, the International City Managers' Association has been publishing **Public Management**, a journal devoted to the art and science of municipal administration. [5] The contents of this journal reflect a range of applied management issues, shifting over its history but centered on personnel administration, fiscal management, and public service provision.

In contrast, federal-level concern for a comprehensive approach to public management has until recently remained undeveloped and diffuse. Although the Brownlow and Hoover Commissions and the Kennedy-Johnson involvement with PPBS all illustrated federal concern for public management, little was done to promote generic public management as a field. The

Civil Service Reform Act (CSRA) changed this situation by giving major impetus to developing a generic public management encompassing the processes and skills required on all levels of government regardless of policy or program area.

The nature of contemporary public management has been strongly influenced by these initiatives at the federal level. Particularly important are two major research endeavors undertaken by the Georgetown Public Service Laboratory (Mushkin, Sandifer, and Familton, 1978) and by the National Academy of Public Administration (NAPA, 1980) to define the scope, nature, and applications of public management research. These two studies of public management research, sponsored or conducted by the federal government, operationalize several of the major assumptions about the nature of contemporary public management.

The first assumption involves a distinction between program-specific research and a broader type of generic management research. In the Georgetown study, the researchers identified two broad categories of public management research and development: (Mushkin, Sandifer, and Familton, 1978:14)

Category I: *Generic* research and development in public management, with intent to advance knowledge or understanding generally of elements in the management process and engineering types of applications, likely to have broad applicability.

Category II: *Mission specific* research and development into elements of public management; limited in scope to a particular purpose, program, agency, or policy; and likely to have only limited applicability to public management generally.

The NAPA Study made a similar distinction by referring to general management as the application of management principles/techniques not confined to any specialized program area.

The question of whether management is truly generic and encompasses the concerns of both public and private administration has plagued scholars for some time. Many texts in the field, usually from the business tradition where the concept of generic administration is more commonly accepted, still affirm the conception of generic management functions (e.g.,

Buchelle, 1977). Most recent thinking tentatively concludes "that there are some apparently significant institutional differences (values, incentives, and constraints)" between the different organizational prototypes. (Fottler, 1981:3) Nonetheless, there remains an implicit suggestion that there are similar, i.e., generic, public management functions---with the emphasis on public.

The second common assumption involves the definition of public management as a government function or process containing specific elements. The Georgetown Study viewed the elements of public management as: Personnel Management; Workforce Planning; Collective Bargaining and Labor-Management Relations; Productivity; Organization/Reorganization; Financial Management; and Evaluation Research. The NAPA Study took a broader approach by delineating only three elements of public management: Personnel Administration; Productivity; and Financial Management.

This delineation of management functions is much closer to POSDCORB-like equations than many of the competing frameworks such as human relations or management science, thus preserving the character of scientific management. It is also distinctly different from the typology developed by the Study Committee on Policy Management Assistance which is important for its effort to establish the relationship between policy analysis and public management. The committee report (U.S. Executive Office of the President, 1975; Macaluso, 1975) divided public management into the categories of policy management---involving the strategic issues of resource allocation; resource management---involving the administrative support function of budgeting, personnel, etc.; and program management---involving the daily operation and implementation of public programs. This three part typology has been moderately successful in captivating the community wishing to integrate policy analysis with public management. The prevailing tendency, however, has been to include the components of policy analysis and public management side by side in a broader listing of functions such as that developed by the Georgetown researchers or the descriptor list used in this study and described in the next section.

The Georgetown and NAPA studies have been instrumental as a basis for defining public management research for the 1980s. Each has contributed to the contemporary conception of public management as a generic field comprised of a set of POSDCORB-like functions. But as the problems involved in their efforts to catalogue and categorize research serve to highlight, the integration of public management and policy analysis is not so complete as the intellectual tradition may suggest.

PUBLIC MANAGEMENT RESEARCH SURVEY

In September, 1980, the authors undertook a study at North Carolina State University with a focus on public management research and building on assumptions similar to the Georgetown and NAPA studies. This project, the National Public Management Research Survey (NPMRS), was sponsored by the National Association of Schools of Public Affairs and Administration (NASPAA) and funded by the U.S. Office of Personnel Management. The fundamental difference between the NPMRS and the previous studies was its focus on academic-based research rather than being limited to federally-sponsored or conducted research. The purpose of NPMRS grew out of concerns raised at the first Brookings Public Management Conference (U.S. Office of Personnel Management, 1980a) about a need to identify research networks in public management and to establish a model for an information system to promote timely exchange in the field.

The data gathered through this systematic survey permit an empirical investigation of the distribution and content of sponsored public management research conducted at the sample of one hundred universities in the United States. [6] From this data, the authors generate a grounded notion of public management, map its major themes, and relate these to historical development in the field. In the section on data and findings, the constructs of primary interest are the extent and scope of public management research. Extent is operationalized by the number of projects identified in the survey, given certain eligibility criteria listed below. Scope is operationalized as the frequency distribution of subjects in the generic public

management descriptor list and the policy area index.

Extent of the Public Management Research

In the first year of the NPMRS, principal investigators were surveyed at one hundred academic institutions in the United States divided between two samples: 1) a random sample of 40 member programs of the National Association of Schools of Public Affairs and Administration; and 2) a purposive sample of 60 major programs, 10 each from six disciplines: business, economics, political science, public policy/administration, psychology, and sociology. Over 300 faculty members, identified by their deans and department heads as conducting public management research, were contacted by telephone to identify individual research projects.

Projects were included in the survey if they met certain eligibility criteria. The first criterion required that the research project be funded by a source outside the university. This included any project with an extramural funding source, federal, state, local or private. The purpose of this criterion was to allow clear identification of projects. Furthermore, it was assumed that internally funded projects were in many cases pilot efforts which, if successful, led to extramurally-funded projects. It was also assumed that any project receiving external funding would have been submitted to some form of peer review process and therefore would be more likely to have a determined methodology and a definite set of research propositions.

The second criterion limited the time period by requiring a starting date, or a refunding date, after January 1, 1979. Thirdly, projects were included only when the principal investigator was a faculty member of the sampled program. The fourth criterion stated that, in the judgment of the principal investigator, the project was generic public management in the sense that it dealt with a function, process or technique which could be undertaken by any major American governmental unit. It was expected that this criterion would help exclude the large number of program-specific evaluations which were so prevalent in the Georgetown Study.

Finally, the fifth criterion required that the project was a research project in that it involved an explicit statement of relationship(s) among operationalized variables or factors. This criterion was applied not to eliminate qualitative studies which did establish research relationships but to exclude such work as literature reviews, state-of-the-art papers, curriculum and training manuals, and purely descriptive or historical accounts.

In order to insure maximum coverage of each school or program, a snowball sample was employed. Each principal investigator was asked to identify colleagues who might have projects meeting the eligibility criteria. A final total of 110 projects was identified as eligible according to the criteria listed above. Survey information and documentation were obtained on all but 9 projects for a response rate of 94%. Almost twice the number of investigators were contacted as there were eligible projects. The largest number of projects were excluded because of a failure to address generic public management research subjects (58). This reflects the existence of a large body of program-specific or policy-specific research---a finding similar to the Georgetown Study. The next largest number of projects were excluded for not being propositionally grounded (33), a criterion which applied to exclude only those projects which involved no research design nor causal inference whatsoever. Finally, a significant number of projects were excluded due to lack of extramural funding (33). In the second year of the NPMRS, this criterion was expanded to include all projects with a formal funding source, both internal and external.

A striking feature of these data is the relatively low number of projects, averaging just over one project per school. Fifty-one schools had no projects at all. Certainly, it can be concluded that extramurally funded generic public management research is not common in the sample of university programs. This finding suggests that public management has yet to become a major field for sponsored academic research. Eliminating or redefining the criteria would increase the number of projects but not enough to change this pessimistic conclusion. [7]

Scope of Public Management Research

One of the major products of the NPMRS is a typology of
generic public management descriptors. Currently, this open-
ended descriptor list has over three hundred terms arranged
hierarchically on five levels. The Generic Public Management
Descriptor List was developed by synthesizing ten existing
management typologies [8] and subsequently subjecting the
list to an iterative feedback process with an advisory panel of
fifty public management experts. A Policy Area Index was
developed in the same manner and is used to categorize public
management research by substantive policy or program area.
Similarly, each case was coded on a number of other dimensions
such as jurisdictional level, field of science, and other variables.
These descriptor lists and variables provide the coding format
not only for categorization and access but also for analyzing the
distribution of public management research. These analytic
capabilities permit us to construct a map of current public
management research, identify areas of concentration or
neglect, and draw conclusions about the scope and content of
the field of public management.

Table 1 presents aggregate data on the frequency of
descriptors on the first two levels of the Generic Public
Management Descriptor List. Since each project could be coded
with up to six descriptors, the numbers do not correspond with
the total number of cases. Each case averages 3.25 descriptors
over all five levels of the descriptor list, indicating that many
research projects address several aspects of public management
simultaneously.

There are several notable aspects to this distribution. First,
there is a heavy skew toward the most general area, Policy and
Program Analysis. This indicates that a great deal of public
management research is done under the aegis of policy
research, particularly in evaluation research. This is consistent
with the Georgetown and NAPA findings, also indicating the
relative sparcity of generic public management research and the
tendency toward policy- or program-specific research. Most of
the projects in this category were program evaluations with
some management content, many using some impact analysis

TABLE 1
FREQUENCY OF GENERIC PUBLIC MANAGEMENT
DESCRIPTORS: LEVELS I AND II

DESCRIPTOR CATEGORIES	FREQUENCY
POLICY AND PROGRAM ANALYSIS	120
Planning	31
Recommendation and Evaluation	37
Implementation and Monitoring	16
Organization Design	13
Data Analysis Methods and Techniques	23
FINANCIAL MANAGEMENT	30
Budgeting	8
Accounting	3
Cost Analysis	2
Revenue Analysis	7
Fund Management	8
Risk Management	0
Financial Administration	2
HUMAN RESOURCE MANAGEMENT	69
Personnel Administration	10
Employee Relations	6
Affirmative Action Planning	4
Productivity and Organizational Effectiveness	20
Productivity and Performance Management	6
Professional Development	14
Organization Development	5
Ethics and Professionalism	4

TABLE 1 (Cont.)

DESCRIPTOR CATEGORIES	FREQUENCY
INFORMATION SYSTEMS AND	
RECORDS MANAGEMENT	15
Information System Management	11
Computer Utilization	4
Hard Copy Information Systems	0
Forms Management and Records	
Security	0
EXTERNAL RELATIONS	110
Networking and Coalitions	79
Public Relations and Public	
Information	8
Administrative Law	10
Fund Raising	1
Innovation Diffusion and	
Transfer	12
OTHER SUPPORT SERVICES	3

(economic, environmental or urban). A project was also listed here if it made a contribution uniquely to management methods and techniques, apart from a policy-specific contribution.

The second most frequent level I category is External Relations which is dominated by descriptors in Networking and Coalitions. Under the level II descriptors are included intergovernmental relations and political environment which are the most frequent descriptors on the entire list. An example of an intergovernmental project is "Tracking the Intergovernmental Fiscal System" which is, of course, also coded in Financial Management. A project coded as political environment is "Administrative Behavior of Federal Bureau Chiefs" which documents the political activities and constraints of a type of federal bureaucrat.

Also highly represented in the survey is a more traditional area of public management, Human Resource Management. Topics in Personnel Administration and Productivity dominate this level I category, reflecting not only the traditional concerns in personnel administration but the newer emphasis on productivity research. Within the Productivity categories there are frequent mentions of organization effectiveness and collective work measures as exemplified by an action-research project on "Organizational Self Assessment." There is less emphasis on individual productivity measures and performance management than the collective or organizational measures.

The level I categories of Financial Management and Information Systems are generally less researched areas in public management. Although a great deal of descriptive material exists on both of these categories, they are not heavily researched. Nonetheless, budgeting and fund management (e.g., contract management) emerge as important topics. Similarly, the emphasis on Information Systems Management is, not surprisingly, on system design and the interface of information with policy-makers while the more traditional records systems receive no research attention at all. A substantial number of projects in these categories were excluded because they were either highly situation-specific (i.e., not generic) or consulting tasks and therefore not propositionally-grounded research.

TABLE 2
FREQUENCY OF POLICY AREA DESCRIPTORS: LEVEL I

DESCRIPTOR CATEGORIES	FREQUENCY
Agriculture	1
Arts and Culture	0
Communications	0
Economic Policy	21
Education	20
Employment and Labor	7
Energy	14
Equal Rights	10
Governmental Management	48
Health	18
International Affairs	2
Law and Public Safety	21
National Security	5
Natural Resources and Environment	13
Science and Technology	6
Human and Social Services	17
Transportation	4

Support Services is a little mentioned category. Research in this area may be conducted internally by the organization, but it is almost entirely ignored by academic researchers.

Public Management Research Applied to Policy Areas

Aggregated data on the frequency of descriptors in the applied policy and program areas of the Policy Area Index are presented in Table 2. Although each project could be multiply-coded, the average was just under two descriptors per case. There is a high likelihood that a project is coded in only one policy area, unlike the public management descriptor list where projects received more cross-coding.

There are several notable aspects to this distribution. First, most of the research is coded under the General Governmental Management category since a large number of the projects could be considered as truly generic in nature and not applied to any specific policy or program area. This finding does confirm the existence of a generic public management as evidenced by research on management processes and functions not specific to any policy or program area, but it also confirms the relatively small proportion of generic research relative to policy-specific research and evaluation.

The other projects are distributed among the other policy areas, showing higher concentration in both the domestic and more strategic areas. Economic Policy, Human and Social Services, Health, Energy, and Law and Public Safety have been more heavily researched vis-a-vis their management aspects than Agriculture, Arts and Culture, or International Affairs and National Security topics. An example of policy research with significant management content is "Intergovernmental Coordination in the Manpower Sector."

THEMES OF CONTEMPORARY PUBLIC MANAGEMENT

Like the authors' predecessors, Gulick, Waldo, Sayre, Wald and others who sought to identify the current themes and trends in public administration, they can outline six themes of contemporary public management which emerge from both the

intellectual history of public management and the provisional evidence gathered in the pilot phases of the NPMRS. In spite of the incredible diversity of public management, these authors believe that the six generalizations which follow are fair inferences insofar as a field can be understood in terms of the research it undertakes. These six themes are thus intended to serve as propositions or hypotheses about the nature of public management.

Public management is still strongly associated with the scientific management tradition of administration.

Contemporary public management is not identical to classical scientific administration. The trends and evidence do suggest, however, that the overall philosophy of public management, as reflected in sponsored research, attempts to recapture the tradition of scientific management as outlined in the classical assumptions. This philosophy is supported by the other themes presented below, but there are also broader social factors contributing to the current philosophy of public management which essentially view government and bureaucracy as needing rational reform at the level of management techniques. Solutions for effective government are assumed to require the application of rational methods of administration. To a large extent, public management philosophy is now expected to emulate that of the private sector where management science has resisted the liberal tide to a much greater degree than has public administration. Indeed, Dwight Waldo (1980:67) draws an interesting analogy by noting that the disproportionate funding and emphasis on business management research puts ''public management in the position of a poor, third world country receiving technical assistance in management.'' It is also, in many ways, an intellectual dependency.

Public management adheres to more rationalistic and technical interpretations of public administration.

Public management aspires to the objective scientific status of the classical doctrines, although the advancement of methods

and technolgies prohibit any exact replications of research or exaggerated claims to copy the physical sciences. Indeed, this is no longer a goal. But public management still presents scientifically-based remedies for today's public management and policy problems. For the most part, public management eschews the new (circa 1971) liberal interpretations of public administration. Social justice values and the criteria of equity and responsibility advocated by the "New PA" have not secured a significant foothold in the public management research surveyed but remain confined to discussions of public administration as political theory. There is little research to suggest that public management is ultimately a question of political theory.

Furthermore, public management research has expanded beyond its original boundaries to include a broad range of topics. Once exclusive topics of the human relations school of public administration, ethics and productivity are now treated in terms of performance appraisal systems, ethical analysis, job analysis, and work measurement. Public management research generally follows a rational methodology prescribed as an approach to administrative theory by Herbert Simon in 1946.

Public management reflects classical principles of administration in a relatively narrow set of evaluative criteria.

If there is a substitute for the principles of the science of administration, it is to be found in the criteria used to measure system and individual variables in public management research. Classical public administration was grounded in the norms of economy and efficiency as adopted from the private sector. The principles of administration---specialization, unity of command, span of control---were designed to maximize these administrative norms. The evolution of public administration saw the creation of criteria more suitable to the public sector but still grounded in the economic notions of efficiency. Primary among the criteria used in public management research is effectiveness, and to a much lesser extent efficiency. Equity and responsibility appeared in rare instances as criteria in the research surveyed. The effectiveness criterion maintains a

fact-value distinction and skirts normative issues by measuring management effectiveness in relation to pre-established goals and objectives. The justification of these goals and objectives belongs more in the domain of policy studies and political science. Contemporary public management research as revealed through the variables-in-use is more preoccupied with the effectiveness of policy implementation and impact.

Public management is not the study of administration separated from the political context.

As recently as last year in a paper presented at the first Brookings Public Management Research Conference, Dwight Waldo (1980) stated that the politics-administration disjunction remained the "most central and crucial" issue in public administration and public management research. The findings of these authors, which indicate the prevalence of research projects explicitly addressing factors of the political environment, sharply contrast with the classical notion of a strict politics-administration dichotomy. Researchers not only recognize the needed fusion but consistently incorporate political factors into their research designs. For, example, projects examining the effects of interest groups on bureaucratic outcomes or the political behavior of administrative officials illustrate a politicized public management research. Another manner in which the political context is introduced into management research is through a consideration of its utilization. One study based its findings entirely on a consideration of users needs in an administrative context.

Public management is closely allied with public policy analysis in its methodological and technical applications.

There is no doubt that there exists a truly generic public management research addressing those functions and processes generally applicable to many governmental units regardless of the policy or program area. Equally important, however, is the body of public policy research which contains a significant amount of management content. This public policy research is

likely to address such issues as implementation, evaluation or impact, i.e., generally post-policy formulation activities. An appropriate analogy between policy and management research is the distinction in economics between macro- and micro-economics. The issues addressed by policy research tend to be on a more abstract macro-level, whereas management issues are typically on the organizational or micro-level. The wedding of public management and public policy research is not merely one of conceptual convenience but includes substantial sharing of techniques such as cost/benefit and cost/effectiveness analysis, or PERT, MBO, ZBB, and so forth. The methodoligies of policy analysis are also shared by public management as indicated by the more methodological research included in the survey on new ways of aggregating individual data, measuring performance, decision preference, and action research.

The wedding of policy and management research further supports the contemporary rejection of an assumed disjunction of politics and administration. Policy, as the word implies, is a product of politics and management is an instrument of politics. "It is in the area in which politics/policy and administration/ management mingle that the crucial problems of the large modern polity are to be found." (Waldo, 1980:69)

Public management is an applied social science with an inter-disciplinary source of theory-based research propositions.

As an applied discipline, public management pulls its theory from all fields and disciplines but, similar to public administation, it has now developed some of its own theory. There are some theories cited in this research survey which have management or administration origins. For example, the implementation theory of Edwards (1980), Edwards and Sharkansky (1978), Olsen's logic of collective action thesis, and the theories (models) of public problem solving (i.e., rational man, psychological model, sociodemographic model) have such origins. Although certainly not without a disciplinary home, these theories are nonetheless used primarily to explain administrative problems in the public sector. For the most part, however, the theory behind the research in this sample is

obscure probably due to the fact that very little public
management research is theory-testing. Most of the research
uses a case study or multiple case study approach, more
appropriate for the applied nature of the research purpose and
the need to relate the research to an organizational setting.

CONCLUSIONS

In this article the authors have tried to present what public
management is, not what it should be. In describing contempo-
rary public management as reflected by the sponsored research
it generates, we have a sense of "deja vu." Contemporary
research strongly reflects traditional concerns going back to the
early days of administrative science. Why is it that scientific
management is not dead, that the "new public administration"
has not become more widespread, that the old politics-adminis-
tration dichotomy is still an issue, or that efficiency and
effectiveness remain the primary normative criteria for
analysis?

The six themes just enumerated suggest answers to these
questions, but there is an underlying tension between the first
and last three themes. The first set of three places public
management in the realm of the rational and scientific,
concerned with techniques and efficiency. It is in this sense that
public management still lies within the traditions of scientific
management and administrative science. The last set of three
themes emphasizes the political dimensions of public manage-
ment research and its alliance with broader topics in policy
studies and disciplines such as political science. It is in this
context that public management goes beyond traditonal analysis
and lays claim to representing a new synthesis.

Whether seen as a new synthesis or merely as a continuation
of old tensions in public administration, these authors believe
the six themes identified above summarize the general map of
public management today. The authors observed that among
practitioners, consultants, and applied research centers there is
an emphasis on the themes representative of the rational-
scientific traditions of public administration. Among other
academics in the disciplines and some of the new policy schools,

there is greater emphasis on political dimensions, policy analysis, and interdisciplinary concerns. Yet this division can be overemphasized easily. It is probably fair to say that both the older public management centers and the newer public policy programs are moving toward each other. Certainly it is easy to find management techniques research at policy programs and political policy studies at management programs.

Public administration includes both public management and public policy within which public management plays a pivotal role. Athough there is ample basis for viewing public management research as traditional in conception, this is a partial-truth only. There is much management research which is generic is nature---not tied to analysis of any policy area---which treats the "policy" concerns of political and social as well as economic choice. Indeed, much management research exists as a rider to policy-related science.

Public management is not scientific management or administrative science although it is still heavily influenced by them. Nor is it policy analysis, new public administration or more recent frameworks. Public management is an inter-disciplinary study of generic aspects of public administration which captures the tensions between rational-instrumental orientations on the one hand and political-polity concerns on the other. As such it raises potentially the most interesting questions of the relationship of theory to practice, of economics to sociopolitical values, and of collective to individual and psychological behavior in administration. The National Public Management Research Survey has documented how very little of this type of research is now being undertaken in this country in spite of its great theoretical and practical importance.

NOTES

1. This article is from a forthcoming book, *Public Management Research in the United States*, by G. David Garson and E. Sam Overman (New York: Praeger Publishers, CBS Educational and Professional Publishers, a division of CBS, Inc., 1983). Copyright Praeger Publishers, 1983. Used with the permission of the publisher.

2. The authors are using Woodrow Wilson's 1887 essay to mark the beginning of the study, although certainly not the practice, of American public administration.

3. For a more complete treatment of the intellectual history of public administration, contemporary public management, and other topics addressed in this article,

refer to *Public Management Research in the United States* (Note 1).

4. For example, the Kennedy School of Government at Harvard has opened a program in public management. Many other schools have initiated programs specifically oriented toward public management. Very recently, the University of Maryland School of Public Affairs opened its Public Management degree program. Of the generic programs, Stanford, Yale, Northwestern, and Rice Universities are the most noted for their joint public/private sector management programs. Much has been reported on the subject. See: Rabinovitz (1981); Windsor (1981).

5. The International City Managers' Association began publishing *Public Management* in 1919.

6. The data reported in this paper were collected using the case survey method. For methodological discussions of the case survey method, see Lucas (1974a, 19754b), Yin and Heald (1974), and Yin and Yates (1975).

7. In the second year of the NPMRS, the sample has been extended to approximately 300 academic programs and research institutes. The preliminary returns show that the average number of projects per program will increase only slightly and the inclusion of internally-funded projects will probably account for this slight increase.

8. The systems surveyed were the GPO Monthly Catalogue, the INFORM Thesaurus Users' Guide to Controlled Vocabulary Subject Terms, Management Contents Data Base Thesaurus, Management Information Service Report Index, Monthly Review of Management Research Index, Municipal Yearbook Cumulative Index, Personnel Management Abstracts Subject Index, Public Administration Abstracts Cumulative Subject Index, Universal Reference System Administrative Management Subject Guide, and the United States Political Science Rotated Subject Descriptor Display.

REFERENCES

Buchele, Robert B. *The Management of Business and Public Organizations*. New York: McGraw-Hill.

Charlesworth, James C. (ed.) (1972). *Integration of the Social Sciences Through Policy Analysis*, Monograph 14. Philadelphia: American Academy of Political and Social Science.

―――― (1965). *Theory and Practice of Public Administration: Scope, Objectives, and Methods*, Monograph 8. Philadelphia: American Academy of Political and Social Science.

Dahl, Robert A. (1947). "The Science of Public Administration: Three Problems." *Public Administration Review* 7 (Winter):1-11.

Dimock, Marshall (1936). "The Age, Meaning, and Scope of Public Administration," in J.M. Gaus, L.D. White, and M. Dimock (eds.). *The Frontiers of Public Administration*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Follett, Mary Purker (1926). "The Giving of Orders." Reprinted in J.M. Shafritz and A.C. Hyde (eds.) (1978). *Classics of Public Administration*. Oak Park, Ill.: Moore Publishing.

Fottler, Myron D. (1981). "Is Management Really Generic?" *Academy of Management Review* 6 (January):1-12.

Fry, Brian and Mark Tompkins (1978). "Some Notes on the Domain of Public Policy Studies." *Policy Studies Journal* 6 (February):305-313.

Garson, G. David (1981). "From Policy Science to Policy Analysis: A Quarter Century of Progress." *Policy Studies Journal* 9. Special Issue 4:535-544.

Gulick, Luther and Lyndall Urwich (eds.) (1937). *Papers on the Science of Administration*. New York: Institute of Public Administration.

Long, Norton (1949). "Power and Administration." *Public Administration Review* 9 (Autumn):257-264.

Lucas, William A. (1974a). *The Case Survey Method and Alternative Methods for Research Aggregation*. Santa Monica, Cal.: Rand.
_____ (1974b). *The Case Study Method: Aggregating Case Experience*. Santa Monica, Cal.: Rand.
Macaluso, Ann C. (1975). "Background and History of the Study Committee on Policy Management Assistance." *Public Administration Review*, Special Issue (December):645-704.
Merkle, Judith A. (1980). *Management and Ideology*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
Mushkin, Selma, Frank Sandifer, and Sally Familton (1978). *Current Status of Public Management Research*. Washington, D.C.: Public Services Laboratory, Georgetown University.
National Academy of Public Administration (1980). *Facilitating the Use of Federally Sponsored Public Management Research by State and Local Government Officials*. Washington, D.C.: NAPA.
Rabinovitz, Francine F. (1981). "The Role of Research in Public Management Programs." A draft paper presented to the National Association of Public Affairs and Administration. Lexington, Ky., October.
Salamon, Lester M. (1981). "Rethinking Public Management: Third Party Government and the Changing Forms of Government Action." *Public Policy* 29 3:255-275.
Sayre, Wallace S. (1958). Premises of Public Administration: Past and Emerging." *Public Administration Review* 18 (Winter):102-105.
Simon, Herbert A. (1946). "The Proverbs of Administration." *Public Administration Review* 6 (Winter):53-67.
U.S. Executive Office of the President (1975). *Strengthening Public Management in the Intergovernmental System*. Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office.
U.S. Office of Personnel Management (1980a). *Setting Public Management Research Agendas: Integrating the Sponsor, Producer, and User*. Report of the First Brookings Conference on Public Management. Washington, D.C.: OPM.
_____(1980b). *Civil Service Reform: A Report on the First Year*. Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office.
_____(1981). *The Changing Character of the Public Work Force*. Report on the Second Brookings Conference on Public Management. Washington, D.C.: OPM.
Wald, Emanuel (1973). "Toward a Paradigm of Future Public Administration." *Public Administration Review* 29 (July/August):366-372.
Waldo, Dwight (1980). "Public Management Research: Perspectives of History, Political Science, and Public Administration," in U.S. OPM. *Setting Public Management Research Agendas: Integating the Sponsor, Producer, and User*. Washington, D.C.: OPM.
_____ (ed.)(1971). *Public Administration in a Time of Turbulence*. Scranton, Penn.: Chandler Publishing.
_____(1955). *The Study of Public Administration*. New York: Random House.
Windsor, Duane (1981). "The Generic School of Administration." Paper presented to the Association for Public Policy Analysis and Management. Washington, D.C., October.
Yin, Robert K. and Karen Heald (1975). "Using the Case Survey Method to Analyze Policy Studies." *Administrative Science Quarterly* 20 (September):371-381.
Yin, Robert K. and Douglas Yates (1975). *Street-Level Government*. Lexington, Mass.: D.C. Heath.